



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,111	05/11/2001	Edwin Wong	40101/02301	7404

30636 7590 06/27/2005
FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP
150 BROADWAY, SUITE 702
NEW YORK, NY 10038

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/854,111

Applicant(s)

WONG ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Mitchell

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an application filed on 5/11/01.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this case.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 recites a software package comprising various modules, but does not provide a tangible embodiment for the modules (i.e. computer readable media). Accordingly the claims are rejected as being not tangibly embodied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,704,736 to Rys et al. (Rys).**

Regarding Claim 7: Rys discloses an application module to perform functions, the application module uses information contained in a configuration file to perform the functions (col. 6, lines 47-52 'Query processor 311 ... processes the image of XML data file 205 ... and returns rowset 207'); and a conversion module converting the configuration file from a first format incompatible with the application module to a second format compatible with the application module (col. 6, lines 16-24 'Parser 307 converts XML data file 205 into a format ... such as the document object model'). Rys inherently discloses that the application program is compatible with the new files and incompatible with the original files. If Rys' application ('query processor') were compatible with the original files ('XML data file') it would not be necessary to convert them (col. 6, lines 16-24 'into a format that is capable of being ... processed by query processor 311').

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6 and 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,704,736 to Rys et al. (Rys) in view of US 6,662,186 to Esquibel et al. (Esquibel).

Regarding Claims 1 and 12: Rys discloses a converter module applying a converter function corresponding to the file format of each of the original files to create new files in a converted file format (col. 6, lines 16-24 'Parser 307 converts XML data file 205 into a format ... such as the document object model').

Rys does not explicitly disclose a receiving module determining a format of each of a plurality of original files but does disclose several file formats that could be used with his invention (col. 5, lines 4-17 'SGML ... graphs').

Esquibel teaches a receiving module determining a format of each of a plurality of original files (col. 4, lines 32-40 'in accordance with the recognized format ... will open the file') in an analogous art for the purpose of providing access to various file formats (col. 1, lines 61-62 'propagating data saved in one file format to another file format').

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Rys' invention with the ability to recognize and parse various file formats as disclosed in Esquibel because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make Rys' invention functional with legacy systems that may be using different or older data formats (Esquibel col. 1, lines 35-41 'A file format ... that was popular just a few years ago may be completely out or vogue today').

Regarding Claims 2, and 13: The rejections of claims 1 and 12 are incorporated, respectively; further Rys discloses an application program to access information in the

new files (col. 6, lines 16-24 'into a format that is capable of being ... processed by query processor 311'), and the application program is compatible with the new files and incompatible with the original files (col. 6, lines 16-24 'into a format that is capable of being ... processed by query processor 311').

Regarding Claim 3, 10 and 14: The rejections of claims 1, 7 and 12 are incorporated, respectively; further Rys discloses the converted file format is a document object model tree (col. 6, lines 16-24 'XML data file 205 is stored in ... (DOM) format').

Regarding Claim 4: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Rys discloses the converter function includes a text parser (col. 5, line 50 'Parser 307 processes XML data file 205').

Regarding Claim 5: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Rys discloses the original files include a configuration file (col. 5, lines 53-55 'stores the processed XML data in active store 309'). Rys' original files ('XML data file') initialize and 'configure' the data upon which the Application ('Query processor') works, and therefore can be considered a configuration file.

Regarding Claim 6: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Rys does not explicitly disclose determining file format based on file extensions.

Esquibel teaches the receiving module determines the format of the original files based on file extensions (col. 4, lines 32-40 'format as determined by the file extension associated with the file').

Regarding Claim 8: The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated; further, Rys does not explicitly disclose the conversion module includes a plurality of converter functions

corresponding to a plurality of file formats, but does disclose several file formats which could be used with his invention (col. 5, lines 4-17 'SGML ... graphs').

Esquibel teaches a conversion module that includes a plurality of converter functions corresponding to a plurality of file formats (col. 4, lines 32-40 'in accordance with the recognized format ... will open the file') in an analogous art for the purpose of providing access to various file formats (col. 1, lines 61-62 'propagating data saved in one file format to another file format').

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Rys' invention with the ability to recognize and parse various file formats as taught in Esquibel because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make Rys' invention functional with legacy systems that may be using different or older data formats (Esquibel col. 1, lines 35-41 'A file format ... that was popular just a few years ago may be completely out or vogue today').

Regarding Claim 9: The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated; further, Rys does not explicitly disclose the conversion module includes a receiving element to determine the first format.

Esquibel teaches a conversion module that includes a receiving element to determine the first format (col. 4, lines 32-40 'in accordance with the recognized format ... will open the file')

Regarding Claim 11, 15: The rejections of claims 7 and 12 are incorporated, respectively; further Rys discloses the first format is an extensible markup language (col. 5, line 50 'XML data file 205').

Regarding Claim 16: the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Rys discloses the new files are saved in one of random access memory and permanent memory (col. 6, lines 35-49 'Active store 309 ... such as ... disk drive ... DRAM').

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,083,276 to Davidson et al and US 6,404,445 to Galea et al. disclose XML configuration files; and US 6,662,342 to Marcy discloses a method of parsing an XML document.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2193

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason Mitchell
6/21/05



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER